

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 18 and 28 to 31 were pending when last examined; claims 19 to 21 were withdrawn. Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 10 to 14, and 17 to 21, and canceled claims 3, 8, 9, 16, and 28 to 31. Claims 1, 2, 4 to 7, 10 to 15, 17, and 18 remain pending; claims 19 to 21 remain withdrawn.

Claim Objection

The Examiner objected to the status of claim 27. Applicant notes that claim 27 was canceled in the May 8, 2003 response to the April 21, 2003 restriction requirement. The listing of claims now correctly reflects that claim 27 was canceled.

Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1 to 4, 6 to 9, 11 to 18, and 28 to 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent NO. 6,144,792 (“Kim et al.”) in view of Japanese Patent Document Nos. 2001-264549 A (“4549A”) and 59-1344111 U (“4111U”).

Claim 1

Claim 1 is patentable over the cited references for reciting “a substantially planar base having a first thumb segment, a second thumb segment, and a finger segment disposed between the first and second thumb segments and extending beyond the extremities of the thumb segments.” Fig. 1C illustrates an exemplary planar base 10 having a finger segment 13 located between and extending beyond thumb segments 11 and 12. None of the cited references disclose the recited planar base.

Claim 1 is further patentable over the cited references for reciting “a bifurcated transverse barrier extending transversely across the finger segment at an end of the finger segment.” Figs. 1A and 1B illustrate an exemplary bifurcated transverse barrier 80. As shown in Fig. 3C, bifurcated transverse barrier 80 allows multiple cable storage devices to be placed side-by-side so that a cable from one device can be routed linearly through an adjacent device. See Specification, p. 14, lines 8 to 17. None of the cited references disclose the recited bifurcated transverse barrier.

For the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

Claim 2

Applicant has amended claim 2 to further clarify the claimed invention.

Amended claim 2 is patentable over the cited references for reciting “a guide track wall [that is] substantially continuous.” In contrast, Kim et al. shows a corresponding inner wall of optical fiber holder 14 having significant breaks. This is because Kim et al. discloses an erbium doped fiber amplifier instead of a cable storage device. As an erbium doped fiber amplifier, the inner wall of optical fiber holder 14 necessitates breaks so that optical fibers can connect to pumping laser diodes 126 and 134 located within the inner wall at central opening 12. See Kim et al., col. 4, line 56 to col. 5, line 9. On the other hand, claim 1 recites a cable storage device with a guide track wall that is substantially continuous since the cable does not need to enter or exit the area within the guide track wall.

Similar to claim 1, amended claim 2 is further patentable over the cited references for reciting “a longitudinal cable channel disposed at the distal portion of the finger segment for routing cable linearly through the apparatus.” Figs. 1A and 1B illustrate an exemplary longitudinal cable channel 80. As shown in Fig. 3C, longitudinal cable channel 80 allows multiple cable storage devices to be placed side-by-side so that a cable from one device can be routed linearly through an adjacent device. None of the cited references disclose the recited bifurcated transverse barrier.

For the above reasons, amended claim 2 is patentable over the cited references.

Claims 3, 4, 6, and 7

Applicant has canceled claim 3, thereby rendering its rejection moot.

Claims 4, 6, and 7 now depend from amended claim 2, and they are patentable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 2.

Claims 8 and 9

Applicant has canceled claims 8 and 9, thereby rendering their rejections moot.

Claims 11 to 15

Claims 11 to 15 now depend from claim 10, which the Examiner has indicated as allowable subject matter. Accordingly, claims 11 to 15 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 10.

Claim 16

Applicant has canceled claim 16, thereby rendering its rejection moot.

Claims 17 and 18

Claims 17 and 18 now depend from amended claim 2, and they are patentable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 2.

Claims 28 to 31

Applicant has canceled claims 28 to 31, thereby rendering their rejections moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 5 and 10 are patentable if amended to independent form.

Applicant has not amended claim 5 to independent claim form because Applicant believes its base claim 2 as amended is patentable over the cited references.

Applicant has amended claim 10 to independent claim form, including the limitations of its base claims 8 and 9. Accordingly, amended claim 10 is in condition for allowance.

Withdrawn Claims

Applicant has amended withdrawn claims 19 to 21 to depend from amended claim 2. Should the Examiner find amended claim 2 to be patentable, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner allow claims 19 to 21 for their dependence from amended claim 2.

Summary

Claims 1 to 18 and 28 to 31 were pending when last examined; claims 19 to 21 were withdrawn. Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 10 to 14, and 17 to 21, and canceled claims 3, 8, 9, 16, and 28 to 31. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the claim objection and claim rejections, and allow pending claims 1, 2, 4 to 7, 10 to 15, 17, and 18 and withdrawn claims 19 to 21. Should the Examiner have any questions, please call the undersigned at (408) 382-0480 x206.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted prior to expiration of the set period of time by being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with § 1.6(a) (4).

/David C Hsia/
Signature

March 17, 2007
Date

Respectfully submitted,

/David C Hsia/

David C. Hsia
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 46,235

Patent Law Group LLP
2635 North First St., Ste. 223
San Jose, California 95134
408-382-0480x206